Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to figure 8. The replacement sheet, which include figure 8, replaces the original sheet including figure 8. In figure 8, reference numeral 146 has been replaced with reference numeral 148. Previously, reference numeral 146 erroneously referred to both block 146 depicted in figure 7 as well as the process depicted in figure 8. In addition, the process depicted in figure 8 was inconsistently referred to in the description by reference numerals 144 and 155. For consistency, the process depicted in figure 8 has been amended to be referenced by reference numeral 148 in both the drawings and the specification.

No new matter is being added by any of the present amendments.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
                 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 10 (and similarly in claim 22) have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "the redirect code is operable to (i) intercept at least one function call made by the application process to access secured data at a remote computer system, and (ii) execute at least one of the redirect functions in place of the at least one intercepted function call so as to enable the application process, executing on the first computing device, to access the secured data at the remote computer system". These amendments are supported by the specification as filed, for example at paragraphs [0010]-[0015]. Claim 10 has been amended to recite, in part, the subject matter of claim 11, as originally filed. In addition, claims 1, 3, 10-14, 17-20, 22-27 and 30-32 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors and for clarity. No new matter is being added by any of the present amendments.

In light of the foregoing amendments, the elements recited in the present claims are interrelated to one another. Hence, it is respectfully requested that the rejections to claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be removed. In addition, the objections to claims 10 and 20 are moot in view of the foregoing amendments.

Claims 1 - 6 and 10 - 33 are patentable over Calder et al. (US PGPUB 2002/0092003) in view of Li et al. (US Patent 7406533).

Claim 1 is patentable over Calder inasmuch as Calder fails to teach or suggest "redirect code ... operable to (i) intercept at least one function call made by the application process to access secured data at a remote computer system, and (ii) execute at least one of the redirect functions in place of the at least one intercepted function call so as to enable the application process, executing on the first computing device, to access the secured data at the remote computer system". Instead, Calder teaches an "interception module [which] allows the application 405 to access approved files on the client computer 140, without altering the systems settings, while simultaneously protecting the contents of the application package 115 from user access". (Calder, paragraph [0085]) As the application executes on the client computer (see, e.g., Calder, paragraphs [0071] and [0074]), the interception module of Calder merely allows the application to access approved files on the same computer on which the application executes (i.e., a local computer), but does not allow "the application process, executing on the first computing device, to access the secured data at the remote computer system", as recited in claim 1. Hence, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over Calder.

Li teaches how to efficiently transmit data from server 128 to client 120 protected behind firewall 124. (Li, figure 3, 3:11-23; 4:60-62; 8:42-44) Thus, the teachings of Li do not concern how to access the data of client 120 protected behind a firewall (i.e., which may be interpreted as

secured data), but rather concern how to deliver data from outside the firewall (i.e., which may be interpreted as unsecured data) through firewall 124 to client 120 in an efficient manner so as to allow, for example, the presentation of video to client 120 in real-time. (Li, 1:52-2:49) Accordingly, even if the teachings of Li were combined with those of Calder, one would not arrive at the invention recited in claim 1. Similarly, the teachings of Li would fail to cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Calder. For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over Calder in view of Li. As claims 10 and 22 recite, *inter alia*, features similar to those recited in claim 1, claims 10 and 22, and their respective dependent claims are likewise patentable over Calder in view of Li.

Claims 7 - 9 are patentable over Calder in view of Li, even in view of Thomas et al. (US Patent 6148336).

Thomas is cited for teaching features of the dependent claims. Even if this is so, Thomas fails to cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of Calder and Li. Therefore, claims 7-9 are patentable over Calder in view of Li and Thomas.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present claims are patentable over the cited references. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 19-3140 for any deficiencies of fees.

Respectfully submitted,
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Date: April 8, 2009

P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station
Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
650-798-0320

/Tarek N. Fahmi/
Tarek N. Fahmi
Reg. No. 41,402